



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/621,286	07/17/2003	Adrian Chandley	MSFT-1973/304061.1	2492
41505 7590 04/30/2007 WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP (MICROSOFT CORPORATION) CIRA CENTRE, 12TH FLOOR 2929 ARCH STREET PHILADELPHIA, PA 19104-2891			EXAMINER PAPE, ZACHARY	
			ART UNIT 2835	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 04/30/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/621,286	CHANDLEY, ADRIAN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Zachary M. Pape	2835	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 March 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-11 and 13-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-11 and 13-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

The following detailed action is in response to the correspondence filed 3/21/2007.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 6, 8-11, 13, 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chu (US 6,216,185) in view of Applicants Admitted Prior Art (Hereinafter, "AAPA").

With respect to claim 1, Chu teaches a docking station (200) for a mobile computer (100), the docking station comprising: a port (292) for receiving the mobile computer, a communication interface (Column 5, Lines 23-27) for communicating with at least one external computer, wherein the external computer and the mobile computer are separate computers; and a display (210) for depicting information exchanged with the at least one external computer; wherein the docking station is itself mobile, has no local host computer core when the mobile computer is uninstalled (Column 4, Lines 48-50), and wherein the docking station (200) enables communications with the mobile computer (100) when the mobile computer is installed into the port (Column 3, Lines 53-67). Chu fails to teach that the docking station enables the communication interface to

acquire the information of the external computer and to display the information when the mobile computer is both uninstalled and without communications with the docking station. AAPA teaches a display device which is absent a mobile computer which enables a communication interface to support communication with at least one external computer (See present specification Paragraph 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the AAPA with that of Chu to provide access to a personal or business computer to allow the full use of the computer while away from the personal computer's fixed location (Paragraph 2). With respect to displaying the information, the display (210) of the docking station (200) can display the information received from the external computer (Column 4, Lines 19-20).

With respect to claim 10, Chu teaches a system supporting communications between a mobile docking station and at least one external computer, the system comprising: a mobile docking station (200) that has no local host computer core when the mobile computer is uninstalled (Column 4, Lines 48-50), the docking station comprising: a port (292) for receiving the mobile computer (100), the mobile computer comprising a handheld computer having an integral display (550), a communication interface (Column 5, Lines 23-27) for communicating with the at least one external computer, wherein the at least one external computer and the mobile computer are separate computers; and a display (210) for depicting information exchanged with the at least one external computer, wherein the mobile docking station supports communication with at least one external device when the mobile computer is installed

Art Unit: 2835

(Column 3, Lines 53-67). Chu further teaches that the docking station (200) which has a mobile computer (100) which is both uninstalled from the docking station and without communications with the docking station, but is silent as to whether the docking station (200) enables the communications interface to support communication with the at least one external computer when the mobile computer in such a state. AAPA teaches a display device which is absent a mobile computer which enables a communication interface to support communication with at least one external computer (See Present specification Paragraph 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the AAPA with that of Chu to provide access to a personal or business computer to allow the full use of the computer while away from the personal computer's fixed location (Paragraph 2).

With respect to claims 2 and 11, Chu further teaches that the display is a display integrated with the docking station (Column 4; Lines 19-20).

With respect to claim 3, Chu further teaches that the port for receiving the mobile comprises a connector (300).

With respect to claim 4, Chu further teaches that the port (292) further receives a chassis (Which the circuitry of 100 is housed within – Column 3, Lines 55-57)) for the mobile computer (Column 3, Lines 53-55).

With respect to claims 6 and 13, Chu further teaches a user interface comprising one or more of a keyboard, a mouse, a touch screen (Column 4, Lines 20-21), a light pen, a stylus, audio interface, tactile transducer, vibration transducer and an external

Art Unit: 2835

connector for an external input/output device permitting interaction with rendered information on the display.

With respect to claims 8 and 14, Chu further discloses that the communication interface for communicating with at least one external computer is one or more of a wireless connection and a wired connection (Column 5, Line 24-28 wherein a LAN connection is either a wired or wireless connection).

With respect to claim 9, Chu further teaches that the mobile computer (100) is one of an ultra compact computer, a computer core (Column 4, Lines 48-50), a handheld computer, and a laptop computer.

2. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chu in view of AAPA and further in view of Watts, Jr. et al (US 6,285,911 – hereinafter “Watts”).

With respect to claim 7, Chu in view of AAPA teach the limitations of claim 1 above but is silent as to the docking station having a receptacle for receiving electrical power. Watts teaches the conventionality of a docking station (9) having a receptacle for receiving power (See Fig 59, see also Column 30, Lines 65-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Watts with that of Chu and AAPA to provide power to both the docking station and the computer core.

Art Unit: 2835

3. Claims 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chu in view of AAPA and further in view of Adler et al. (US 6,342,901).

With respect to claim 15, Chu teaches the limitations of claim 14 above but is silent as to the wireless connection being one or more of a radio frequency connection, an infrared connection, and an acoustic connection. Adler et al. teaches the conventionality of having a LAN with a radio frequency connection (Column 6, Lines 58-61). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Adler et al. with that of Chu and AAPA to provide a connection to a network that does not require cables.

With respect to claim 16, Chu teaches the limitations of claim 10 above but is silent as to the at least one external device is one or more of a remote computer and a peripheral device. Adler et al. teaches the conventionality of a remote device being a computer which can be connected to through a LAN (Column 6, Lines 52-61). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Adler et al. with that of Chu to further increase the computing capability of the docking station (200) of Chu.

With respect to claim 17, Adler et al. teaches that the remote computer is one or more of a desktop computer and a laptop computer (Column 6, Lines 52-54).

With respect to claim 18, Adler et al. further teaches that the peripheral device (I.E. printer 124) is connected to a computer system (Via the LAN).

4. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chu in view of AAPA and further in view of Janik et al. (US 2002/0065902).

With respect to claim 19, Chu in view of AAPA teaches the limitations of claim 10 above but is silent as to the external device is one or more of a network interface, a personal digital assistant, and one or more mobile docking stations. Janik et al. teaches the conventionality of having a PDA which has a LAN connection (Paragraph 39) which could connect to the LAN of Chu. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Janik et al. with that of Chu and AAPA to provide further information services to the PDA (Paragraph 12).

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 3/21/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to the Applicant's remarks on page 6 that, "Chu teaches away from the claimed invention because Chu requires that an ACM be installed before a fully operational computer system is realized", the Examiner respectfully disagrees. As noted in the present remarks on page 5, Chu explicitly states that in order to form a fully operational computer (emphasis added), an ACM is coupled with a PCON (See Also, Column 3, lines 3-4). The Examiner notes that in the absence of the ACM/PCON combination the PCON is simply not a fully functional computer – not that the ACM must be installed before any function is realized as alleged (See Page 7 of the present

remarks). Therefore Chu clearly suggests that the PCON can perform other functions in the absence of the ACM – though it cannot perform the function of a fully operational computer. The Examiner alleges that since the PCON has all the infrastructure (hardware) to connect and communicate with other devices, the PCON is suggested as having limited functionality with other devices. For example, the PCON could connect to another device such as a PDA, IPOD®, cell phone, printer, (All fairly characterized as a computer) etc.. and enable communications with it in the absence of the ACM via the communication interfaces and circuitry therein. Such teachings/suggestions are congruent with the AAPA which teaches a device which has no computer core which in the absence of the computer core can enable communications with other external devices. As such, Chu does not teach away from the combination and therefore one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to combine the teachings of Chu and AAPA to arrive at the claimed invention.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Art Unit: 2835

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Zachary M. Pape whose telephone number is 571-272-2201. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. - Thur. (7:00am - 5:30pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jayprakash Gandhi can be reached at 571-272-3740. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ZMP


4/26/07
JAYPRAKASH GANDHI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER